Neurocognitive function after childhood cancer

Buizer, A.I.

2008

document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Chapter 1

General Introduction

CHILDHOOD CANCER

The chance of a child developing cancer before the age of 18 is around 1 in 400 in the general population. In The Netherlands, around 500 new cases of childhood cancer are diagnosed each year. Leukemia and brain tumors are the most common types of childhood cancer. Leukemia accounts for around 30% of cases, with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) showing the highest incidence (75% of the leukemias). Brain tumors comprise around 20% of new cases of childhood malignancy.[1,2]

CHILDHOOD CANCER SURVIVAL

Four decades since the beginning of multimodality treatment for childhood cancer survival rates have risen substantially. During the twentieth century, 5-year survival figures have increased from around 25% in children diagnosed in the 1960s to around 75% in children diagnosed in the 1990s. The introduction of combination chemotherapy in the late 1960s and early 1970s greatly improved chances of survival, and since that time the results of clinical trials have led to further progress in the treatment of pediatric malignancies. The centralization of specialized care has further helped to ensure that the majority of children with cancer today receive the currently best treatment. The survival trends for ALL have been most striking, improving from around 5 percent in the early 1970s to over 80% for the children diagnosed between 1991 and 1996.[3] In other common diagnostic groups large advances have also been made, for example in non-Hodgkin lymphoma and Wilms tumor, with recent 5-year survival rates reported to be around 85% [4] and 90%,[5,6] respectively. Improvement of survival of childhood brain tumors has been less pronounced – current 5-year survival rates for all central nervous system (CNS) tumors are around 65%. Between childhood brain tumor subtypes, however, prognosis varies considerably. Astrocytomas have the most favorable 5-year survival rate, around 77%.[7] These data are current for the developed countries only. In resource-poor countries the cure rate is often still lower than 35%. The great majority of 5-year survivors may be regarded as cured, with around a 10% risk of death from recurrent primary tumor, a second malignancy, or death of a treatment-related cause during the ensuing years.[8,9] As a consequence of the increased survival, the number of childhood cancer survivors in the population is steadily increasing.

CHILDHOOD CANCER TREATMENT

Most children are treated in a standardized way, according to treatment protocols which are part of clinical trials. In the Netherlands, the Dutch Childhood Leukemia Study group (DCLSG), later the Dutch Childhood Oncology Group (DCOG), has developed treatment protocols. International pediatric co-operative

groups include the International Berlin Frankfurt Muenster (I-BFM) study group, the International Society of Pediatric Oncology (SIOP) and the Children's Oncology Group (COG). Surgery, radiation and chemotherapy are the treatment modalities available to treat cancer in children. Often, multimodal treatment is employed in children. For many solid tumors, surgery is the primary and most effective treatment. For larger tumors, radiation or chemotherapy is often used before surgery to reduce the size of the tumor, make surgery safer for the patient, and lessen any physical or functional defects. For hematologic malignancies, combined chemotherapy treatment is the most important option.

LATE EFFECTS OF CHILDHOOD CANCER TREATMENT

Cancer therapy can affect not only cancer cells but also other rapidly dividing normal cells, such as those in the gastrointestinal tract, bone marrow, hair follicles, reproductive system and nervous system. Because of this, unwanted side effects of the treatment can and often do occur. It has become clear that damage to organ systems due to cancer treatment in children may not become clinically evident for many years. It is also becoming apparent that survivors of childhood cancer have a high rate of illness owing to chronic health conditions.[10] Special late effects clinics have been established in childhood cancer centers to monitor these long-term effects in childhood and into adulthood.[11]

NEUROTOXICITY OF CHILDHOOD CANCER TREATMENT

Cranial irradiation has been associated with cognitive decline in children with brain tumors and children with leukemia.[12,13] Children with ALL receive CNS-directed treatment to prevent recurrence of the disease in the cerebromeningeal space. Intellectual dysfunction typically occurs gradually after radiotherapy and tends to be progressive in nature.[14] In children with ALL, evidence of a detrimental effect of prophylactic cranial irradiation on neurocognitive function[15-17] has led to the development of chemotherapy-only protocols, using CNS-directed chemotherapy, with the same rate of treatment success.[18-22] However, many chemotherapeutic agents also have central neurotoxic properties.

The major chemotherapeutic agents used in childhood cancer that have central neurotoxic properties are:

Methotrexate

Methotrexate is an anti-metabolite. The main action of methotrexate is interference with RNA and DNA synthesis by the inhibition of the enzyme dihydrofolate reductase.[23] Clinically, methotrexate associated neurotoxicity is related to seizures and stroke-like episodes in the acute and subacute phase, and with

cognitive impairment in the chronic or late phase.[24] Demyelinisation,[25] cerebrovascular damage,[26] damage to astrocytes,[27] impaired synthesis of neurotransmitters[28] and production of excitotoxic amino acids[29,30] are all processes that have been suggested to occur as a consequence of methotrexate administration. Radiographically, white matter changes have been documented during treatment of children with ALL with methotrexate.[31-33]

Cytarabine

Cytarabine is an anti-metabolite, a synthetic pyrimidine analogue which affects DNA synthesis by competitive inhibition of DNA polymerase. It is used both systemically and intrathecally in the treatment of children with ALL. Regarding neurotoxic effects, clinically it has been associated mainly with acute cerebellar dysfunction,[34,35] with aseptic meningitis, myelopathy in rare cases, and with acute peripheral polyneuropathy.[36]

Corticosteroids

Historically, prednisone has been the corticosteroid used most often in the treatment of ALL but more recently, dexamethasone has gained use because of greater bioavailability,[37] superior anti-leukemic activity in vitro[38,39] and enhanced CNS penetration.[40] A connection between corticosteroid use and cognitive function has been suggested, with a special vulnerability of the hippocampus and the frontal lobes for its effects.[41] While acute behavioral effects of exogenous corticosteroids have been documented in adults as well as in children,[42-44] little is known about the long-term effects of corticosteroids, especially in the developing child. It has been suggested that especially dexamethasone may be associated with long-term cognitive effects in children with ALL.[45]

Vincristine

Vincristine is a vinca-alkaloid, inhibiting cell proliferation by binding to tubulin and disrupting the function of mitotic spindle microtubules.[46] The neurotoxic effects of vincristine are probably caused by interference with axonal transport through reaction with microtubules within axons,[47,48] eventually leading to axonal degeneration.[49] Although highly toxic to the CNS when administered intrathecally,[50,51] central neurotoxicity from intravenous vincristine is rare, most likely due to poor penetration through the intact blood-brain barrier.[52] Peripheral neuropathy due to vincristine therapy, however, occurs frequently in children with cancer. This is a primarily axonal, symmetric mixed sensory-motor, and autonomic polyneuropathy which is more marked distally.[53,54] Usually, signs of vincristine-related neuropathy regress quickly after discontinuation,[55] but neurological signs in combination with peripheral nerve tract injury have been reported

for up to five years after end of treatment with vincristine in children with ALL.[56-58]

As postnatal development of the brain is not complete until nearly the end of the second decade of life[59] and less mature structures in the CNS are thought to be more vulnerable to neurotoxic damage than more mature ones,[60] children with cancer may be especially vulnerable to possible neurotoxic side-effects of treatment. During childhood and adolescence, white matter increases its overall volume[61] and fiber tracts become more myelinated in a region-specific fashion.[62] There is evidence of a relationship between myelination and functional maturity of the brain.[63-65] The myelination of the prefrontal cortex and of cerebellar-prefrontal networks has a protracted course during childhood and adolescence,[66,67] and consequently these structures may have a large window of vulnerability during development.[68] Evidence for cerebellar-frontal subsystem changes, as detectable by magnetic resonance imaging, has been reported in children with ALL treated with chemotherapy only.[69]

Direct effects of chemotherapy and cranial irradiation on intra-cranial endothelial cells, brain white matter, as well as immunological mechanisms could be involved in the pathogenesis of CNS damage.[24,60,70-72] Also changes in cerebral blood flow and glucose metabolism have been reported.[73] Damage to white matter as well as failure to develop white matter at a rate appropriate to the developmental stage, could partly account for neurocognitive decline in cancer survivors.[74]

NEUROCOGNITIVE EFFECTS OF CANCER TREATMENT

Impairment of attention and information processing are among the most frequently reported neuropsychological side-effects of childhood cancer treatment,[75] and have been suggested to underlie the cognitive deficits and academic difficulties observed following treatment for childhood cancer.[75-79] These functions depend on integrity of neural networks in the brain and efficient exchange of information between distributed brain areas.[80-82]

The basic neuropsychological mechanisms of attention and information processing are critical for normal cognitive development. Deficits in these functions can hamper intellectual, emotional and social development and are associated with learning problems and behavioral disturbances. An increase in the rate of behavioral problems, measured using standardized checklists, has been reported in childhood cancer survivors,[83-85] but these reports are contrasted by studies that suggest that survivors do not differ importantly from controls and/or are within normal limits.[77,86,87] Educational attainment in survivors of has been reported to

be compromised.[88] The reports often concern heterogeneous samples and do not always specify outcome by diagnosis- or treatment group. Regarding neurocognitive outcome, it appears that chemotherapy may not be a benign form of treatment, although its effects may be more subtle than those produced by cranial irradiation.[89-92] Even though mean psychological adjustment in pediatric cancer survivors may be near normal levels, more subtle or specific areas can be adversely affected in long-term survivors.[93]

ASSESSMENT OF NEUROCOGNITIVE FUNCTION

Contemporary neuropsychological models describe the various mechanisms of attentional functioning and information processing consistently as acting together as an integrated functional system, underpinned by a neuroanatomical system.[94-96] This network includes the brain stem, aspects of the subcortex and posterior cortical regions and the prefrontal cortex. These models commonly identify a number of components of attention: processing speed (the rate at which tasks are performed), selective attention (the capacity to attend to relevant stimuli), shifting attention (the ability to move flexibly from one concept to another) and sustained attention (the ability to maintain attention to a task for prolonged periods).[97]

To assess attention and information processing in the participants in our studies, the Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks program (ANT)[98,99] was used. Previously, this program has been used to examine a wide range of disorders associated with attention and information processing deficits.[100-102] The paradigms used are designed to tap skills ranging from basic reaction speed and simple perceptual-motor processes to neuropsychological functions underlying the more complex cognitive processes. Attentional components of the tasks are manipulated, while all other parameters are maintained unchanged, in order to assess that certain component of attention. The reaction time paradigms on which the tasks are based, are modeled according to the attention theory of Shiffrin and Schneider.[103,104] Shiffrin and Schneider developed a dual process model where a distinction was made between automatic and controlled processing. Over-learned tasks are assumed to be executed completely automatically, while new tasks require full attention and a conscious controlled effort. Both processes can occur parallel. While automatic processing is almost unlimited in capacity, controlled processing is thought to proceed in a serial manner and is limited in capacity. Because the capacity of the information processing system is limited, attentional mechanisms are necessary to select information. The Additive Factor Method of Sternberg[105] is applied to derive information about each stage of information processing. The increase of the reaction time resulting

from manipulation of separate stages of information processing using specific tasks, provides information on the efficiency of processing at that certain stage. Sanders[106] extended Sternberg's concept to a hierarchical cognitive-energetic model: the efficiency of information processing is assumed to be determined by the interplay of computational processes (processing stages), situational factors (energetical mechanisms: arousal-effort-activation) and executive control/evaluation. Although the model may be criticized, e.g. for the assumption of a strict serial order of computational processes, the model is an important and valuable method in the empirical and clinical research domain.[107,108]

REFERENCES

1. SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2002. Bethesda. MD: National Cancer Institute, 2002.

2. Netherlands Cancer Registry. Childhood Cancer in The Netherlands 1989 -1997. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Association of Comprehensive Cancer Centers, 2000.

3. Spector L.G., Ross J.A., Robison L.L., Bhatia S. Epidemiology and etiology. In: Pui CH. Childhood Leukemia, 2 ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006:48-68.

4. Marky I, Bjork O, Forestier E et al. Intensive chemotherapy without radiotherapy gives more than 85% event-free survival for non-Hodgkin lymphoma without central nervous involvement - A 6-year population-based study from the Nordic Society of Pediatric Hematology and Oncology. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 2004;26:555-560.

5. Tournade MF, Com-Nougue C, de Kraker J et al. Optimal duration of preoperative therapy in unilateral and nonmetastatic Wilms' tumor in children older than 6 months: Results of the ninth International Society of Pediatric Oncology Wilms' tumor trial and study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2001;19:488-500.

6. Weirich A, Ludwig R, Graf N et al. Survival in nephroblastoma treated according to the trial and study SIOP-9/GPOH with respect to relapse and morbidity. *Ann Oncol.* 2004;15:808-820.

7. Arndt V, Kaatsch P, Steliarova-Foucher E, Peris-Bonet R, Brenner H. Up-to-date monitoring of childhood cancer long-term survival in Europe: central nervous system tumours. *Ann Oncol.* 2007;18:1734-1742.

8. Cardous-Ubbink MC, Heinen RC, Langeveld NE et al. Long-term cause-specific mortality among five-year survivors of childhood cancer. *Pediatr Blood Cancer.* 2004;42:563-573.

9. Mertens AC, Yasui Y, Neglia JP et al. Late mortality experience in five-year survivors of childhood and adolescent cancer: The childhood cancer survivor study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2001;19:3163-3172.

10. Oeffinger KC, Mertens AC, Sklar CA et al. Chronic health conditions in adult survivors of childhood cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355:1572-1582.

11. Blaauwbroek R, Groenier KH, Kamps WA, Meyboom-de JB, Postma A. Late effects in adult survivors of childhood cancer: the need for life-long follow-up. *Ann Oncol.* 2007;18:1898-1902.

12. Meadows AT, Gordon J, Massari DJ, Littman P, Fergusson J, Moss K. Declines in IQ scores and cognitive dysfunctions in children with acute lymphocytic leukaemia treated with cranial irradiation. *Lancet.* 1981;2:1015-1018.

13. Duffner PK, Cohen ME. The long-term effects of central nervous system therapy on children with brain tumors. *Neurol Clin.* 1991;9:479-495.

14. Palmer SL, Goloubeva O, Reddick WE et al. Patterns of intellectual development among survivors of pediatric medulloblastoma: a longitudinal analysis. *J Clin Oncol.* 2001;19: 2302-2308.

15. Moss HA, Nannis ED, Poplack DG. The effects of prophylactic treatment of the central nervous system on the intellectual functioning of children with acute lymphocytic leukemia. *Am J Med.* 1981;71:47-52.

16. Fletcher JM, Copeland DR. Neurobehavioral effects of central nervous system prophylactic treatment of cancer in children. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 1988;10:495-537.

17. Cousens P, Waters B, Said J, Stevens M. Cognitive effects of cranial irradiation in leukaemia: a survey and meta-analysis. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 1988;29:839-852.

18. Veerman AJ, Hahlen K, Kamps WA et al. High cure rate with a moderately intensive treatment regimen in non- high-risk childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Results of protocol ALL VI from the Dutch Childhood Leukemia Study Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 1996;14:911-918.

19. Kamps WA, Bokkerink JP, Hahlen K et al. Intensive treatment of children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia according to ALL-BFM-86 without cranial radiotherapy: results of Dutch Childhood Leukemia Study Group Protocol ALL-7 (1988-1991). *Blood.* 1999;94:1226-1236.

20. Tubergen DG, Gilchrist GS, O'Brien RT et al. Prevention of CNS disease in intermediate-risk acute lymphoblastic leukemia: comparison of cranial radiation and intrathecal methotrexate and the importance of systemic therapy: a Childrens Cancer Group report. *J Clin Oncol.* 1993;11:520-526.

21. Nachman J, Sather HN, Cherlow JM et al. Response of children with high-risk acute lymphoblastic leukemia treated with and without cranial irradiation: a report from the Children's Cancer Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 1998;16:920-930.

22. Kamps WA, Bokkerink JP, Hakvoort-Cammel FG et al. BFM-oriented treatment for children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia without cranial irradiation and treatment reduction for standard risk patients: results of DCLSG protocol ALL-8 (1991-1996). *Leukemia.* 2002;16:1099-1111.

23. Kamen BA, Cole PD, Bertino JR. Folate Antagonists. In: Bast, Kufe, Pollock, Weichselbaum, Holland, Frei. Cancer Medicine, 5 ed. Hamilton, Ontario: B.C. Decker, Inc., 2000.

24. Vezmar S, Becker A, Bode U, Jaehde U. Biochemical and clinical aspects of methotrexate neurotoxicity. *Chemotherapy.* 2003;49:92-104.

25. Surtees R, Clelland J, Hann I. Demyelination and single-carbon transfer pathway metabolites during the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukemia: CSF studies. *J Clin Oncol.* 1998;16: 1505-1511.

26. Osterlundh G, Bjure J, Lannering B, Kjellmer I, Uvebrant P, Marky I. Regional cerebral blood flow and neuron-specific enolase in cerebrospinal fluid in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia during induction treatment. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 1999;21:378-383.

27. Gregorios JB, Soucy D. Effects of methotrexate on astrocytes in primary culture: light and electron microscopic studies. *Brain Res.* 1990;516:20-30.

28. Millot F, Dhondt JL, Hayte JM, Bauters F. Impairment of cerebral biogenic amine synthesis in a patient receiving high-dose methotrexate. *Am J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 1992;14:276-278.

29. Quinn CT, Griener JC, Bottiglieri T, Hyland K, Farrow A, Kamen BA. Elevation of homocysteine and excitatory amino acid neurotransmitters in the CSP of children who receive methotrexate for the treatment of cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 1997;15:2800-2806.

30. Kishi S, Griener J, Cheng C et al. Homocysteine, pharmacogenetics, and neurotoxicity in children with leukemia. *J Clin Oncol.* 2003;21:3084-3091.

31. Asato R, Akiyama Y, Ito M et al. Nuclear magnetic resonance abnormalities of the cerebral white matter in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia and malignant lymphoma during and after central nervous system prophylactic treatment with intrathecal methotrexate. *Cancer.* 1992;70:1997-2004.

32. Paakko E, Harila-Saari A, Vanionpaa L, Himanen S, Pyhtinen J, Lanning M. White matter changes on MRI during treatment in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia: correlation with neuropsychological findings. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 2000;35:456-461.

33. Wilson DA, Nitschke R, Bowman ME, Chaffin MJ, Sexauer CL, Prince JR. Transient white matter changes on MR images in children undergoing chemotherapy for acute lymphocytic leukemia: correlation with neuropsychologic deficiencies. *Radiology.* 1991;180:205-209.

34. Herzig RH, Hines JD, Herzig GP et al. Cerebellar toxicity with high-dose cytosine arabinoside. *J Clin Oncol.* 1987;5:927-932.

35. Hwang TL, Yung WK, Estey EH, Fields WS. Central nervous system toxicity with high-dose Ara-C. *Neurology.* 1985;35:1475-1479.

36. Openshaw H, Slatkin NE, Stein AS, Hinton DR, Forman SJ. Acute polyneuropathy after high dose cytosine arabinoside in patients with leukemia. *Cancer.* 1996;78:1899-1905.

37. Van de Lagemaat S, Nagel JD, Bode U. Clinical pharmacokinetics of glucocorticoids. *Int J Pediatr Hemato Oncol.* 1999;6:261-274.

38. Kaspers GJ, Veerman AJ, Popp-Snijders C et al. Comparison of the antileukemic activity in vitro of dexamethasone and prednisolone in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 1996;27:114-121.

39. Ito C, Evans WE, McNinch L et al. Comparative cytotoxicity of dexamethasone and prednisolone in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *J Clin Oncol.* 1996;14:2370-2376.

40. Balis FM, Lester CM, Chrousos GP, Heideman RL, Poplack DG. Differences in cerebrospinal fluid penetration of corticosteroids: possible relationship to the prevention of meningeal leukemia. *J Clin Oncol.* 1987;5:202-207.

41. Belanoff JK, Gross K, Yager A, Schatzberg AF. Corticosteroids and cognition. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2001;35:127-145.

42. Brown ES, Khan DA, Nejtek VA. The psychiatric side effects of corticosteroids. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 1999;83:495-503.

43. Drigan R, Spirito A, Gelber RD. Behavioral-Effects of Corticosteroids in Children with Acute Lymphoblastic-Leukemia. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 1992;20:13-21.

44. Schmidt LA, Fox NA, Goldberg MC, Smith CC, Schulkin J. Effects of acute prednisone administration on memory, attention and emotion in healthy human adults. *Psychoneuroendocrinol.* 1999;24:461-483.

45. Waber DP, Carpentieri SC, Klar N et al. Cognitive sequelae in children treated for acute lymphoblastic leukemia with dexamethasone or prednisone. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 2000;22:206-213.

46. Jordan MA, Thrower D, Wilson L. Mechanism of Inhibition of Cell-Proliferation by Vinca Alkaloids. *Cancer Res.* 1991;51:2212-2222.

47. Green LS, Donoso JA, Hellerbettinger IE, Samson FE. Axonal-Transport Disturbances in Vincristine-Induced Peripheral Neuropathy. *Ann Neurol.* 1977;1:255-262.

48. Sahenk Z, Brady ST, Mendell JR. Studies on the Pathogenesis of Vincristine-Induced Neuropathy. *Muscle Nerve.* 1987;10:80-84.

49. Shelanski ML, Wisniewski H. Neurofibrillary degeneration induced by vincristine therapy. *Arch Neurol.* 1969;20:199-206.

50. Shepherd DA, Steuber CP, Starling KA, Fernbach DJ. Accidental Intrathecal Administration of Vincristine. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 1978;5:85-88.

51. Alcaraz A, Rey C, Concha A, Medina A. Intrathecal vincristine: Fatal myeloencephalopathy despite cerebrospinal fluid perfusion. *J Toxicol Clin Toxicol.* 2002;40:557-561.

52. Kellie SJ, Barbaric D, Koopmans P, Earl J, Carr DJ, de Graaf SSN. Cerebrospinal fluid concentrations of vincristine after bolus intravenous dosing - A surrogate marker of brain penetration. *Cancer.* 2002;94:1815-1820.

53. Gidding CE, Kellie SJ, Kamps WA, de Graaf SS. Vincristine revisited. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* 1999;29:267-287.

54. Reinders-Messelink HA, Van WT, Fock JM et al. Mild axonal neuropathy of children during treatment for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. *Europ J Paediatr Neurol* 2001;4:225-233.

55. Postma TJ, Benard BA, Huijgens PC, Ossenkoppele GJ, Heimans JJ. Long-term effects of vincristine on the peripheral nervous system. *J Neurooncol.* 1993;15:23-27.

56. Harila-Saari AH, Vainionpaa LK, Kovala TT, Tolonen EU, Lanning BM. Nerve lesions after therapy for childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Cancer.* 1998;82:200-207.

57. Harila-Saari AH, Huuskonen UEJ, Tolonen U, Vainionpaa LK, Lanning BM. Motor nervous

pathway function is impaired after treatment of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia: A study with motor evoked potentials. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 2001;36:345-351.

58. Lehtinen SS, Huuskonen UE, Harila-Saari AH, Tolonen U, Vainionpaa LK, Lanning BM. Motor nervous system impairment persists in long-term survivors of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Cancer.* 2002;94:2466-2473.

59. Hopewell JW. Radiation injury to the central nervous system. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 1998; Suppl 1:1-9.

60. Ciesielski KT, Lesnik PG, Benzel EC, Hart BL, Sanders JA. MRI morphometry of mamillary bodies, caudate nuclei, and prefrontal cortices after chemotherapy for childhood leukemia: multivariate models of early and late developing memory subsystems. *Behav Neurosci.* 1999;113:439-450.

61. Sowell ER, Trauner DA, Gamst A, Jernigan TL. Development of cortical and subcortical brain structures in childhood and adolescence: a structural MRI study. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2002;44:4-16.

62. Paus T, Zijdenbos A, Worsley K et al. Structural maturation of neural pathways in children and adolescents: in vivo study. *Science.* 1999;283:1908-1911.

63. Van der Knaap MS, Valk J, Bakker CJ et al. Myelination as an expression of the functional maturity of the brain. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 1991;33:849-857.

64. Huttenlocher PR, Dabholkar AS. Regional differences in synaptogenesis in human cerebral cortex. *J Comparat Neurol.* 1997;387:167-178.

65. Reiss AL, Abrams MT, Singer HS, Ross JL, Denckla MB. Brain development, gender and IQ in children - A volumetric imaging study. *Brain.* 1996;119:1763-1774.

66. Fuster JM. Frontal lobe and cognitive development. *J Neurocytol.* 2002;31:373-385.

67. Klingberg T, Vaidya CJ, Gabrieli JDE, Moseley ME, Hedehus M. Myelination and organization of the frontal white matter in children: a diffusion tensor MRI study. *Neuroreport.* 1999;10: 2817-2821.

68. Ciesielski KT, Harris RJ, Hart BL, Pabst HF. Cerebellar hypoplasia and frontal lobe cognitive deficits in disorders of early childhood. *Neuropsychologia.* 1997;35:643-655.

69. Lesnik PG, Ciesielski KT, Hart BL, Benzel EC, Sanders JA. Evidence for cerebellar-frontal subsystem changes in children treated with intrathecal chemotherapy for leukemia - Enhanced data analysis using an effect size model. *Arch Neurol.* 1998;55:1561-1568.

70. Ball WSJ, Prenger EC, Ballard ET. Neurotoxicity of radio/chemotherapy in children: pathologic and MR correlation. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 1992;13:761-776.

71. Reddick WE, Glass JO, Palmer SL et al. Atypical white matter volume development in children following craniospinal irradiation. *Neuro Oncol.* 2005;7:12-19.

72. Glover DA, Byrne J, Mills JL et al. Impact of CNS treatment on mood in adult survivors of childhood leukemia: a report from the Children's Cancer Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 2003;21:4395-4401.

73. Kahkonen M, Harila-Saari A, Metsahonkala L et al. Cerebral blood flow and glucose metabolism in long-term survivors of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. *Eur J Cancer.* 1999;35: 1102-1108.

74. Mulhern RK, Merchant TE, Gajjar A, Reddick WE, Kun LE. Late neurocognitive sequelae in survivors of brain tumours in childhood. *Lancet Oncol.* 2004;5:399-408.

75. Butler RW, Copeland DR. Attentional processes and their remediation in children treated for cancer: a literature review and the development of a therapeutic approach. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc.* 2002;8:115-124.

76. Brouwers P, Poplack D. Memory and learning sequelae in long-term survivors of acute lymphoblastic leukemia: association with attention deficits. *Am J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 1990;12:174-181.

77. Anderson V, Smibert E, Ekert H, Godber T. Intellectual, educational, and behavioural sequelae after cranial irradiation and chemotherapy. *Arch Dis Child.* 1994;70:476-483.

78. Anderson V, Godber T, Smibert E, Ekert H. Neurobehavioural sequelae following cranial irradiation and chemotherapy in children: an analysis of risk factors. *Pediatr Rehabil.* 1997;1: 63-76.

79. Smibert E, Anderson V, Godber T, Ekert H. Risk factors for intellectual and educational sequelae of cranial irradiation in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. *Br J Cancer.* 1996;73:825-830.

80. Corbetta M, Shulman GL. Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2002;3:201-215.

81. Slagter HA, Giesbrecht B, Kok A et al. fMRI evidence for both generalized and specialized components of attentional control. *Brain Res.* 2007;1177:90-102.

82. Jermakowicz WJ, Casagrande VA. Neural networks a century after Cajal. *Brain Res Rev.* 2007;55:264-284.

83. Mulhern RK, Wasserman AL, Friedman AG, Fairclough D. Social competence and behavioral adjustment of children who are long- term survivors of cancer. *Pediatrics.* 1989;83:18-25.

84. Carpentieri SC, Mulhern RK, Douglas S, Hanna S, Fairclough DL. Behavioral Resiliency Among Children Surviving Brain-Tumors - A Longitudinal-Study. *J Clin Child Psychol.* 1993;22:236-246.

85. Arvidson J, Larsson B, Lonnerholm G. A long-term follow-up study of psychosocial functioning after autologous bone marrow transplantation in childhood. *Psycho-Oncol.* 1999;8:123-134.

86. Newby WL, Brown RT, Pawletko TM, Gold SH, Whitt K. Social skills and psychological adjustment of child and adolescent cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncol.* 2000;9:113-126.

87. Noll RB, MacLean WE, Whitt JK et al. Behavioral adjustment and social functioning of long-term survivors of childhood leukemia: Parent and teacher reports. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 1997;22:827-841.

88. Barrera M, Shaw AK, Speechley KN, Maunsell E, Pogany L. Educational and social late effects of childhood cancer and related clinical, personal, and familial characteristics. *Cancer.* 2005;104:1751-1760.

89. Moleski M. Neuropsychological, neuroanatomical, and neurophysiological consequences of CNS chemotherapy for acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol.* 2000;15: 603-630.

90. Raymond-Speden E, Tripp G, Lawrence B, Holdaway D. Intellectual, neuropsychological, and academic functioning in long-term survivors of leukemia. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2000;25:59-68.

91. Shuper A, Stark B, Kornreich L, Cohen IJ, Avrahami G, Yaniv I. Methotrexate-related neurotoxicity in the treatment of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Isr Med Ass J.* 2002;4:1050-1053.

92. Von der Weid N, Mosimann I, Hirt A et al. Intellectual outcome in children and adolescents with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia treated with chemotherapy alone: age- and sex-related differences. *Eur J Cancer.* 2003;39:359-365.

93. Patenaude AF, Kupst MJ. Psychosocial functioning in pediatric cancer. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2005;30:9-27.

94. Mirsky AF, Pascualvaca DM, Duncan CC, French LM. A model of attention and its relation to ADHD. *Mental Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev.* 1999;5:169-176.

95. Posner MI, Petersen SE. The attention system of the human brain. *Annu Rev Neurosci.* 1990;13:25-42.

96. Stuss DT, Shallice T, Alexander MP, Picton TW. A multidisciplinary approach to anterior attentional functions. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1995;769:191-211.

97. Anderson VA, Godber T, Smibert E, Weiskop S, Ekert H. Impairments of attention following treatment with cranial irradiation and chemotherapy in children. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2004;26:684-697.

98. De Sonneville LMJ. Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks: a computer-aided assessment program. In: B.P.L.M.den Brinker, P.J.Beek, A.N.Brand, S.J.Maarse, L.J.M.Mulder. Cognitive ergonomics, clinical assessment and computer-assisted learning: Computers in psychology. Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1999:187-203.

99. De Sonneville LMJ. Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks: Scientific and clinical applications. (Dutch). *Tijdschrift voor Neuropsychologie.* 2005;0:27-41.

100. Slaats-Willemse D, Swaab-Barneveld H, de Sonneville L, van der ME, Buitelaar J. Deficient response inhibition as a cognitive endophenotype of ADHD. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2003;42:1242-1248.

101. De Sonneville LM, Boringa JB, Reuling IE, Lazeron RH, Ader HJ, Polman CH. Information processing characteristics in subtypes of multiple sclerosis. *Neuropsychologia.* 2002;40:1751-1765.

102. Huijbregts SC, de Sonneville LM, Licht R, van Spronsen FJ, Verkerk PH, Sergeant JA. Sustained attention and inhibition of cognitive interference in treated phenylketonuria: associations with concurrent and lifetime phenylalanine concentrations. *Neuropsychologia.* 2002;40:7-15.

103. Shiffrin RM, Schneider W. Controlled and Automatic Human Information-Processing .2.

Perceptual Learning, Automatic Attending, and A General Theory. *Psychol Rev.* 1977;84:127-190.

104. Schneider W, Shiffrin RM. Controlled and Automatic Human Information-Processing .1. Detection, Search, and Attention. *Psychol Rev.* 1977;84:1-66.

105. Sternberg S. The discovery of the processing stages: extension of Donder's method. *Acta Psychol.* 1969;8:276-315.

106. Sanders AF. Towards a model of stress and human performance. *Acta Psychol.* 1983;53:61-97.

107. Sergeant J. The cognitive-energetic model: an empirical approach to attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2000;24:7-12.

108. Sergeant JA. Modeling attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a critical appraisal of the cognitive-energetic model. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2005;57:1248-1255.